

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TOMAHAWK MANUFACTURING, INC.,  
et al.,

Plaintiffs

v.

SPHERICAL INDUSTRIES, INC., et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:23-cv-01007-APG-NJK

**Order**

I previously ordered the defendants and their counsel to show cause why they should not be held in civil contempt of court, sanctioned under the court's inherent power, or sanctioned under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 for filing on the public docket documents that are currently the subject of protective and sealing orders in this court and in the Oregon court despite repeated admonitions not to engage in this conduct. *See Shell Offshore Inc. v. Greenpeace, Inc.*, 815 F.3d 623, 629 (9th Cir. 2016); *United States v. Bright*, 596 F.3d 683, 694 (9th Cir. 2010); *Am. Unites for Kids v. Rousseau*, 985 F.3d 1075, 1088 (9th Cir. 2021).

The defendants and their counsel filed a timely response. ECF No. 535. However, that response does not address the defendants' conduct of (1) filing an unsealed version of the plaintiffs' complaint even though that document has not been unsealed in its entirety in this case and (2) publicly revealing information about a deal with a fast-food franchise even though that information has not been unsealed in this case. I therefore direct the defendants to supplement their response to the order to show cause to address these issues, and I extend the time for the response and reply briefs.

////

1 I THEREFORE ORDER that by July 31, 2025, the defendants and their counsel shall  
2 show cause why they should not be held in civil contempt of court or sanctioned under the  
3 court's inherent power or under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 for revealing sealed information in ECF Nos.  
4 509, 509-2, 509-3, and 514 without leave of this court or the Oregon court. In addition to the  
5 response they have already filed at ECF No. 535 (which they need not refile or repeat), the  
6 defendants and their counsel shall specifically address their conduct of (1) filing an unsealed  
7 version of the plaintiffs' complaint even though that document has not been unsealed in its  
8 entirety in this case and (2) publicly revealing in the unredacted motion (ECF No. 509) and reply  
9 (ECF No. 514) information about a deal with a fast-food franchise even though that information  
10 has not been unsealed in this case.

11 I FURTHER ORDER that the plaintiffs may respond to the defendants' order to show  
12 cause response by August 6, 2025, and the defendants may file a reply by August 15, 2025.

13 DATED this 15th day of July, 2025.



14  
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 ANDREW P. GORDON  
17 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23